

SCHNEIDER-NIESK3
10/683,754

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,071,433 to Naestoft et al. The Examiner has also rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naestoft et al. as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Great Britain Patent No. GB 2202745. The Examiner has stated that claims 6 and 10 would be allowable and that claim 12 is allowed.

Claim 1 is hereby amended to include the elements of claim 6. Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice. In addition, new claim 13 has been added, which includes many of the elements of claims 1 and allowable claim 10. In addition, new claim 14 is introduced as well. No new matter has been added.

New claim 14 differs from the reference to Naestoft et al. in that Naestoft et al. discloses an adhesive element that extends only across a small or minor portion of a back section.

SCHNEIDER-NIESK3
10/683,754

In contrast, the present invention, as claimed in claim 14, discloses an adhesive element that extends over a majority portion of the back section. The design as claimed in claim 14 thus creates a more stable device where it has a much larger amount of adhesive disposed across the back section. Support for this feature can be found in specification on page 9 last paragraph, and on page 10 of the specification. For example, the adhesive can be described as a flat adhesive element 2 which is then glued to the back of this breast prosthesis 1. Thus, it can be clearly shown in FIGS. 1, and 2-5 that the adhesive 2 covers a majority portion of the back section of the breast prosthesis.

It is respectfully submitted that this feature distinguishes the present invention over the above-cited reference to Naestoft et al. and therefore claim 14 is patentable over the above-cited references taken either singularly or in combination.


SCHNEIDER-NIESK3
10/683,754

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that
the claims be allowed and that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHNEIDER-NIESKINS

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802


Allison C. Collard, Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,298
Elizabeth C. Richter Reg. No. 35,103
William C. Collard Reg. No. 38,411

Attorneys for the Applicants

Enclosure(s): Extension Of Time

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Fax No. 703-872/9306 _____

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by
facsimile transmission to the U.S.P.T.O. to Patent Examiner D.
Isabella__ at Group No.3738, to 1-703-872-9306 on June 2, 2005.


Attorney Name